DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 038 909 HE 001 453

AUTHOR Ellis, Joseph P.; Thompson, Michael L.
TITLE A Report on the Status, Cause, and Future of Student Unrest on American College and University Campuses.
INSTITUTION Northern Illinois Univ., De Kalb.
PUB DATE [69]
NOTE 25p.

EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$1.35
DESCRIPTORS *Activism, *Attitudes, Faculty, Governance, *Higher Education, Student Alienation, *Student Attitudes, *Student Behavior, Student Participation

ABSTRACT

This study describes an effort to determine faculty, student and administrator opinions regarding the status, causes and consequences of student unrest in senior colleges and universities throughout the country. Questionnaires were sent to a student, faculty member and administrator at each of 612 accredited, four-year institutions selected at random. Completed questionnaires were received from 983 persons or 53.6%. The findings showed that student unrest has manifested itself on the majority of campuses during the past 5 years, but less than 5% of faculty and students participated in activities related to unrest. Student unrest tended to be expressed through legal and generally accepted protest activities. Administrators rarely ignored the protests and tended to engage in dialogue with the students. Relatively few resorted to the use of force. On most campuses, the situations that led to unrest no longer exist or are less severe. The lack of communication, especially between students and administrators, was most frequently cited as a cause for unrest, but lack of opportunity for student participation in policy formation also contributed significantly, as did objection to the principle of in loco parentis. Expectations are that student unrest will continue, that the amount and scope of demands as well as resistance to them will increase, but that many of the present demands will be met. (AF)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED038909

A REPORT ON THE STATUS, CAUSE, AND FUTURE OF STUDENT UNREST ON AMERICAN COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY CAMPUSES

Joseph R. Ellis and Michael L. Thompson
Professors of Education
Northern Illinois University

Colleges and universities have contributed extensively to and have been affected directly by the rapid and vast change that has characterized the United States since World War II. Through teaching, research and service functions, American institutions of higher education now exert perhaps as much or more influence on life in this country than does any other agency within the society. By their very nature, colleges and universities have become well-springs of knowledge, ideas and values. As a result of expanded research and service activities, coupled with the "enrollment explosion," the kind and degree of their social impact has increased and has become progressively encompassing. For example, the influence of two currently accelerating and major developments -- achievements in science and technology and movements for social reform -- have contributed to the scope and pace of change and to a general state of unrest throughout the society.

By the mid 1960's, after delay due in part to a lag in awareness and interest, the growing unrest in the larger community had reached the American college campus in undeniable proportions. On a large number of these campuses many of the nation's ills now have been brought into focus as never before by students, faculty and persons from outside of the academic community. The new concerns, often presented by a confusing cant,

HE001453

have become the object of dissent and the basis of demands for change in both the society and the institutions themselves. On some campuses dissent has become commonplace and protests and disorders have reached the status of the ordinary. Thus have confrontations developed which have defined value differences that in turn have accentuated gaps between academic positions, social classes, the generations and the races. These harsh events have brought American higher education into the penetrating foci of national attention. The media, in a manner similar to its coverage of a major war, have provided regular reports and discussions of the happenings on the country's campuses. From a variety of sources charges of irrelevance, indifference, incongruence, incompetence and indulgence have been lodged against the colleges and universities. The very nature of higher education is now being questioned, if not threatened, as never before.

To accommodate the differences and the demands of the several elements of the academic community and of the public in an ad hoc manner may yield superficial and ultimately highly undesirable outcomes. To respond to these problems and situations without adequate information, either in the councils of the academic community or in the chambers and offices of government may be to the detriment of institutions of higher education and to those persons directly associated with them and to the society that they serve. Workable solutions must be developed from a basis of understanding. Identification and description are necessary procedures before valid explanations and understandings of the situation can be achieved, causations established and accurate predictions made.

To what extent have American senior colleges and universities experienced student unrest? To what extent have members of the academic community

participated in the various expressions of student unrest? What are the causes of the unrest? What is the status of the problems and situations associated with the unrest? In what ways have administrators responded to demands and confrontation situations growing out of student unrest? Do students, faculty members and administrators perceive the unrest similarly? Has the media provided a representative and valid account of the situation? And lastly, what are the consequences and the probable future of the student unrest movement? It was within the context of the above described developments and to these questions that the study presented here was addressed and to which this report endeavors to "tell it like it is."

Purpose and Design. The study determined opinions regarding the status, causes and consequences of student unrest in senior colleges and universities throughout the United States. The survey method was used with a sample of 612 randomly selected, accredited, four-year institutions of higher education. In the spring of 1969 a questionnaire was developed and sent to three persons (an administrator responsible for student affairs, a student, and a faculty member) in each of the 612 institutions comprising the sample. These individuals were selected because of their direct involvement in the day-by-day life of their academic community. Data were treated by numbers and percents to yield descriptions and allow comparisons between and among the three categories of respondents and also to permit analysis on the basis of institutional characteristics.

Terms. For purposes of the study, student unrest was defined as being characterized by feelings of dissatisfaction based on a perception of the status and trends of contemporary society as expressed by acts of dissent.

Findings. Completed questionnaires were received from 983 or 53.6% of the 1,836 persons who represented the 612 institutions that comprised the sample. These were analyzed on the basis of total response and for the responses of students, faculty members and administrators. Comparisons were then made between and among these three elements of the academic community. The data pertained to the period from the fall of 1964 until the spring of 1969. Findings are presented with reference to the questions posed in the introductory paragraphs of this report and are organized around the status, causes and estimates of the future of the student unrest. An examination of the data presented in TABLES I - IX will provide answers to a number of questions which the reader might raise; however, it should be remembered that the data are based on reports of events and the opinions of individuals and consequently may reflect inaccuracy and bias.

Findings Regarding the Status of Student Unrest. The analysis of the data clearly established that student unrest, as defined in this study, has existed on the majority of American college and university campuses during the past five years. The extent of this unrest is indicated by data presented in TABLE I. For all respondents, 57.7% reported activities of student unrest on their campuses. From these data it is interesting to note the difference in perception of the campus situation; 69.3% of the students as compared to 48.3% of the administrators reported actual student unrest activities on their campuses while 60.3% of the faculty so reported.

TABLE I

Responses to the Question, "Since September, 1964, have there been open conflict or other forms of confrontation involving student demands for structural and functional changes in your institution?"*

Respondents	Number	Percent	YES Number	YES Percent	NO Number	NO Percent
All Respondents	963	98.3**	556	57.7	391	40.6
Administrators	352	37.6**	170	48.3	182	51.7
Faculty Members	310	33.2**	187	60.3	123	39.7
Student Leaders	274	29.3**	191	69.7	83	30.3

*Not all respondents answered all questions, consequently, percentages often do not equal 100.

**Percent based on total of 983 responses.

TABLE II

Responses to the Question, "In what form(s) did the student unrest on your campus manifest itself?"*

Manifested Form of Unrest	Overall Response No.	%	Student Response No.	%	Faculty Response No.	%	Administrator Response No.	%
Discussion	518	93.2	180	94.2	174	93.0	157	92.4
Recommendations from Students	513	92.3	179	93.7	172	92.0	155	91.2
Peaceful Picketing	261	46.9	85	44.5	85	45.5	86	50.6
Walkouts	80	14.4	29	15.2	25	13.4	23	13.5
Sit-Ins	170	30.6	64	33.5	44	23.5	59	34.7
Racial Conflicts	130	23.4	57	29.8	39	20.9	32	18.8
Presentation of Student Demands	428	77.0	147	77.0	149	79.7	127	74.7
Student Acts of Intimidation	95	17.1	26	13.6	31	16.6	35	20.6
Unauthorized Occupation of Institutional Facilities	111	20.0	33	17.3	32	17.1	44	25.9
Disruption of Classes or Instructional Functions	84	15.1	27	14.1	23	12.3	31	18.2
Destruction of Institutional Property and Equipment	39	7.0	10	5.2	10	5.3	16	9.4
Interference with Open Access on the Campus	41	7.3	11	5.8	10	5.3	17	10.0
Physical Violence	26	4.7	7	3.7	9	4.8	9	5.3
Closing the Institution	13	2.3	6	3.1	5	2.7	2	1.2

*Not all respondents answered all questions, consequently, percentages often do not equal 100.

The reports of the various forms in which the student unrest manifested itself appear in TABLE II. Four general forms of student unrest activities were identified from the total response to the survey. These forms and the percent reporting specifically associated activities are: (1) communicating activities (discussion, 92.3%; recommendations, 92.3%; and presenting demands, 77.0%); (2) generally accepted protest activities (peaceful picketing, 46.9%; walkouts, 14.4%; and sit-ins, 30.6%); (3) extra legal non-violent activities (student acts of intimidation, 17.1%; unauthorized occupation of institutional facilities, 20.0%; and disruption of classes or institutional functions, 15.1%); and (4) extra legal violent activities (destruction of institutional property and equipment, 7.0%; interference with open access on the campus, 7.3%; physical violence, 4.7%; and closing the institution, 2.3%.) It should be noted that the reported frequency of the unrest activity decreased with the severity of the activity.

Three patterns emerged from an analysis of this data. First, the responses of faculty members were generally clustered between those of the students and the administrators. Secondly, the faculty members' responses were more like those of the students than those of the administrators. Thirdly, it follows that the greatest variances found were between the responses of the students and the administrators. This tendency of perceptual differentiation increased with the severity of the form of the unrest activity.

An important finding of the study was the percentage of students and faculty members reported to have participated in various forms of activities associated with student unrest (see TABLE III). Approximately

two-thirds of those who reported student unrest on their campuses indicated that less than 10% of their student body participated in the activities associated with the unrest. The data obtained regarding the extent of faculty participation in activities in support of student unrest was similar to that for student participation, while at the other extreme, 7.9% of the respondents reported that 50% or more of the students on their campuses participated in acts of unrest and 3.6% reported that 50% or more of the faculty took part in activities in support of the unrest. The responses of the students and the faculty tended to be in closer agreement with each other than they did with those of the administrators.

TABLE III

Responses to the Question, "Approximately what percentage of the academic community at your institution has participated in the various forms of activities expressing student unrest on your campus?"*

Academic Community	Those Reporting Unrest on the Campus		Students Reporting Unrest		Faculty Reporting Unrest		Adm. Reporting Unrest	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Students:								
0-5%	220	39.6	42	22.0	69	36.3	105	61.8
6-10%	141	25.4	48	25.1	56	29.3	34	20.0
11-25%	94	16.9	38	19.9	36	19.3	19	11.2
26-50%	57	10.3	31	16.2	17	9.1	9	5.3
50% or more	44	7.9	25	13.1	12	6.4	7	4.1
Faculty Supporting Students:								
0-5%	290	52.2	78	45.9	91	48.7	118	69.4
6-10%	89	16.0	28	16.5	38	20.3	19	11.2
11-25%	60	10.8	31	18.2	20	10.7	8	4.7
26-50%	38	6.8	19	11.2	15	8.0	4	23.5
50% or more	20	3.6	9	5.3	10	5.3	1	.6

*Not all respondents answered all questions, consequently, percentages often do not equal 100.

The reports of actions taken by college administrators in response to student unrest activities which occurred on their campuses indicated that relatively few resorted to the use of force. (See TABLE IV.) The effectiveness of their most frequently reported action, dialogue with students, must be questioned when one notes that the single most frequently reported cause of student unrest (see TABLE VII was ineffective communications between students and administrators.

The responses of the students, faculty, and administrators form distinct patterns with the students generally differing with the other two groups. As was observed in the case of previous questions, students tended to differ on more items and in a greater percentage with the administrators than with the faculty. The greatest discrepancy regarding administrator actions occurred for the item, "ignored the situation," where 18.3% of the students reported this as an administrative reaction to the unrest activities while only 4.7% of the administrators were in agreement with them. On three points the views of the three groups were in very close proximity. These were, "dialogue with students," "granting of student demands," and "warnings or threats."

When data pertaining to the status of the problems and situations which led to the student unrest were obtained (see TABLE V), it was found that slightly more than one-third of the respondents reported that these problems and situations had been resolved or no longer existed on their campuses. Of the two-thirds who indicated a persistence of the causative problems and situations, the majority indicated them to be less severe than in the recent past. However, 21.6% of all respondents were of the opinion that these problems and situations were unchanged or had become more severe than before on their campuses.

Once again, the students' responses provided a variance in perception from that of the faculty and administrators with the greatest differences existing between them and the administrators. Generally, the students did not report as much progress toward solutions of problems and improvement of causative situations as did the faculty and administrators.

TABLE IV

Responses to the Question, "What means were employed by the administration of your institution to respond to the confrontation situation where student unrest was manifested?"*

Means of Response	Overall		Student		Faculty		Administrators	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Dialogue with Students	544	97.8	180	94.2	187	100.0	171	100.0
Granted Student Demands	317	57.0	119	62.3	102	54.5	92	54.1
Warning or Threats	135	24.8	53	27.7	42	22.5	38	22.4
Ignored the Situation	50	8.9	35	18.3	14	7.5	8	4.7
Use of Campus Security Forces	84	15.1	21	11.0	25	13.4	34	20.0
Use of Off-Campus Forces	65	11.7	19	9.0	18	9.6	25	14.7

*Not all respondents answered all questions, consequently, percentages often do not equal 100.

TABLE V

Responses to the Question, "What is the status of the problems and situations which have led to the student unrest on your campus?"*

Status	Overall No.	Overall %	Students No.	Students %	Faculty No.	Faculty %	Administrators No.	Administrators %
Have Been Resolved	174	31.3	47	24.8	54	28.9	69	40.5
No Longer Exist	16	2.9	4	2.1	3	1.6	9	5.0
Have Been Ignored	32	5.7	23	12.0	8	4.3	1	0.5
Continue But Are Less Severe	308	55.3	96	50.3	110	58.8	97	57.0
Are Unchanged	80	14.4	36	18.8	25	13.4	17	10.0
Have Become More Severe	40	7.2	21	11.0	7	3.7	12	7.7

*Not all respondents answered all questions, consequently, percentages often do not equal 100.

Findings Regarding the Cause of Student Unrest. The opinions reported by members of the academic community concerning the cause of student unrest on their campuses were grouped under six major classifications: (1) communication, (2) governance, (3) curriculum, (4) student life, (5) personal factors and (6) off-campus influences. (See TABLE VI.) Responses for these six classifications ranged from a high of 59.9% for communication to a low of 48.0% for personal factors as causes of student unrest. The narrowness of the variance did not indicate a dominance of any single classification. However, the data for sub-categories within the classifications represent more significant specificity and yield greater differences and thereby present dominant opinions not noticeable within the overview of the classifications.

In the area of communications, responses ranged from a high of 70.7% for a lack of communication between students and administrators to a low of 17.5% who considered poor communication between students and off-campus persons to be causes of the unrest. It should be noted that the ineffective communications between students and administrators was reported as a cause of student unrest more frequently than was any other single factor in the study.

For the area of governance, responses ranged from 52.7% for vague procedures for policy development and limited opportunity for student participation in institutional governance to 28.6% who considered the need for an adequate judiciary and due process system to be causes of the unrest.

With regard to curriculum, wide variation in responses was found. The range extended from a high of 54.0% who believed limited opportunity for students to influence curricular decisions to a low of 10.8% who attributed sufficient curriculum demands on student time and abilities to be causative.

TABLE VI

Responses to the Question, "In your opinion which of the following do you consider to be causative factors regarding the student unrest on your campus?"*

Possible Causative Factors	Overall		Students		Faculty		Administrators	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Communication:	333	59.9	136	71.2	107	57.2	84	49.4
Between students & Adm.	393	70.7	146	76.4	132	70.6	110	64.7
Between students & faculty	267	47.3	91	47.6	82	43.8	90	52.9
Between faculty & student leaders	185	33.3	64	33.5	59	31.6	60	35.3
Between faculty & Adm.	244	43.9	88	46.1	85	45.5	65	38.2
Between student & off-campus community authorities	97	17.5	31	16.2	32	17.1	31	18.2
Governance:	296	53.2	120	66.8	101	50.0	70	41.2
Limited opportunity for student participation in institutional governance	293	52.7	109	57.1	107	57.2	72	42.4
Vague procedures for policy development	293	52.7	118	61.7	103	55.1	67	39.4
Need for an adequate judiciary and due process system	159	28.6	73	38.2	53	28.3	30	17.6
Student non-involvement in faculty personnel decision making	211	37.9	89	46.6	61	32.6	58	34.1
Curriculum:	304	54.7	121	63.3	104	55.6	82	48.2
Limited opportunity for students to influence curricular decisions	317	57.0	121	63.3	104	55.6	93	54.7
Relevance of curriculum to needs of student body	298	53.6	115	60.2	96	51.3	88	51.8
Rigid or narrow curriculum offerings	163	29.3	79	41.3	49	26.2	35	20.6
Insufficient curricular demands on student time and abilities	60	10.8	28	14.7	18	9.6	14	8.2
Poor teaching performance	148	26.6	70	36.6	43	23.0	38	22.3
Excessively large classes	70	12.6	29	15.2	21	11.2	21	12.4
Lack of opportunity for students to evaluate instruction	179	32.2	77	40.3	52	27.8	50	29.4
Failure to provide special programs to serve needs of unique groups of students	216	38.9	87	45.5	69	36.9	61	35.9

(Continued on next page)

TABLE VI (Cont.)

	Overall		Students		Faculty		Administrators	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Limited attention given to individual needs of students	129	23.2	50	26.2	46	24.6	34	20.0
Overemphasis on grades	177	31.8	88	46.1	53	28.3	38	22.4
Faculty indifference to student needs	147	26.4	51	26.7	47	25.1	52	30.6
Student Life:	326	58.5	135	70.7	113	60.4	79	46.5
Student housing	245	44.1	110	57.6	69	36.9	67	39.4
Student health services	122	21.9	56	29.3	36	19.3	30	17.6
Psychological and counseling services	112	20.1	51	26.7	38	20.3	23	13.5
Cultural activities	126	22.7	60	31.4	37	19.8	31	18.2
Student organizations	136	24.5	52	37.2	43	23.0	43	25.3
Recreational facilities	139	25.0	61	31.9	46	24.6	34	20.0
Racism	182	32.7	74	38.7	56	30.0	53	31.2
In loco-parentis	314	56.5	118	61.8	112	59.9	85	50.0
Double jeopardy and double standards	163	29.3	89	46.6	42	22.6	32	18.8
Institutional and student value conflicts	307	55.2	120	62.8	99	52.9	90	52.9
Financial assistance	83	14.9	39	20.4	26	13.9	18	10.6
Student employment opportunities	41	7.4	22	11.5	11	5.9	8	4.7
Institutionally imposed restrictions on student decision-making	246	44.2	115	60.2	76	40.6	55	32.4
Personal Factors:	267	48.0	97	50.8	99	52.9	72	42.4
A fad of youth	105	18.9	22	11.5	45	24.0	38	22.4
Campus group relations	136	24.5	58	30.4	41	21.9	37	21.8
Impersonal relations on campus	124	22.3	46	24.1	37	19.8	41	24.1
Threat of the draft	168	30.2	57	29.8	59	31.6	55	32.4
Attention, recognition or status seeking activities	173	31.1	42	22.0	65	34.8	68	40.0
Immaturity of students	162	29.1	56	29.3	56	29.9	52	30.6
Sexuality	54	9.7	23	12.0	19	10.2	13	7.5
Student poor mental health	33	5.9	10	5.2	15	8.0	11	6.5
Search for personal identity	275	49.5	96	50.3	93	49.7	88	51.8
Search for one's role in society	317	57.0	108	56.5	109	58.3	101	59.4
Off-Campus Influences:								
Mass media	193	34.7	67	35.1	63	33.7	65	38.2
Off-campus organizations	121	21.8	34	17.8	39	20.9	50	29.4
Off-campus individuals	132	23.7	40	20.9	39	20.9	54	31.8

*Not all respondents answered all questions, consequently, percentages often do not equal 100.

A wide variation in responses was also found in the area of student life. The range here was from 56.5% for the principle of "in loco-parentis" to 7.4% who deemed student employment opportunities to be causes of the unrest.

When the data pertaining to personal factors were examined, it was found that responses ranged from 57.0% for the "search for one's role in society" to a low of 5.9% who thought student poor mental health to be causes of the unrest.

Lastly, the data regarding specific aspects of off-campus influences yielded a lower percentage than that which was generally observed in the other areas. These responses ranged from a high of 34.7% for the "mass media" to a low of 21.8% who thought off-campus organizations to be the causes of the student unrest on their campuses.

An analysis of the data on the basis of the responses of students, faculty and administrators revealed a rather pronounced pattern in which the responses of the faculty tend to lie between those of the students and the administrators with the greatest variances and frequency of variance occurring between the reports of the students and the administrators. This pattern is similar to that noted in the data pertaining to the report of the status of unrest.

Findings Regarding the Expected Future of Student Unrest. When asked, "Do you expect serious manifestations of student unrest on your campus within the next year?", 27.2% of all respondents replied "yes," while 79.6% said "no." (See TABLE VII.) A wide difference was noted between the responses of administrators ("yes", 20.3% and "no", 79.9%) and students ("yes", 35.0% and "no", 64.9%.) Faculty answers, as in the case of previous questions,

tended to fall between these two extremes ("yes", 23.0% and "no", 76.9%) Additionally, respondents were asked to indicate if they expected in the near future on their campus specific forms of manifestations of student unrest. (See TABLE VIII.) The four most frequently expected forms of unrest were: (1) increased student demands, 58.5%; (2) continued but less severe activities associated with student unrest, 50.2%; (3) increased faculty support for students, 43.4%; and (4) increased institutional resistance to student unrest activities, 32.0%. In contrast, those least expected activities were: (1) periodic closing of the institution, 1.9%; (2) an ignoring of expressions of student unrest, 7.7%; and (3) an increase in violence, 8.3%.

Of the three responding groups, the students expected a greater increase in student demands than did either the faculty or administrators. The reverse was found to be true regarding expected "continued but less severe activities." Here 58.2% of the administrators responded "yes" as compared to 43.4% of the students. An incongruence was noted in the data in TABLE VIII regarding "increased faculty support for students." Here 65.4% of the students answered "yes" while only 35.8% and 32.3% of the faculty and administrators respectively responded "yes." On two significant points the three groups were in very close agreement in that they held essentially the same expectations regarding "increased institutional resistance to student unrest activities" and "the periodic closing of the institution."

TABLE VII

Responses to the Question, "Do you expect serious manifestations of student unrest on your campus within the next year?"**

Respondents	Number	Percent	YES Number	YES Percent	NO Number	NO Percent
All Respondents	772	78.5*	197	27.2	575	79.6
Administrators	280	28.4*	57	20.3	223	79.7
Faculty Members	265	26.9*	61	23.0	204	76.9
Student Leaders	217	22.0*	76	35.0	141	64.9

*Percent based on total of 983 responses.
**Not all respondents answered all questions, consequently, percentages often do not equal 100.

TABLE VIII

Responses to the Question, "Within the next year (1969-70) do you expect that on your campus there will be.....?"*

Expectations	Overall No.	Overall %	Students No.	Students %	Faculty No.	Faculty %	Administrators No.	Administrators %
in effect, an end to manifestations of student unrest	116	20.9	39	20.4	38	20.3	44	25.9
an ignoring of expressions of student unrest	43	7.7	27	14.1	11	5.9	7	4.1
continued but less severe activities associated with student unrest	279	50.2	83	43.4	100	53.5	99	58.2
an unchanged situation regarding student unrest	112	20.1	35	18.3	48	25.7	29	17.1
more frequent and more severe confrontations growing out of student unrest	132	23.8	68	35.6	29	15.5	35	20.6
increased student demands	325	58.5	133	69.6	98	52.4	96	56.5
an increase in violent activities	46	8.3	21	11.0	10	5.3	16	9.4
periodic closing of the institution	11	1.9	4	2.1	4	2.1	3	1.8
increased faculty support for students	244	43.4	125	65.4	67	35.8	55	32.3
abridgement of academic freedom for both faculty and students	108	19.4	51	26.7	28	15.0	31	18.2
increased institutional resistance to student unrest activities	178	32.0	64	33.5	57	30.5	61	35.9
increased use of off-campus resources to confront student unrest activities	71	12.8	25	13.1	22	11.8	25	14.7
increased restrictions on expression of dissent	68	12.2	30	15.7	21	11.2	19	11.2

*Not all respondents answered all questions, consequently, percentages often do not equal 100.

While it was deemed important that the study ascertain the expectations for future unrest on the campuses, opinions with respect to the consequences of past activities were also obtained to provide a basis for judging the student unrest movement. It can be observed from the data in TABLE IX that of the twenty-one possible specific outcomes resulting from student unrest activities, six were expected by more than 50% of all respondents. These were: (1) greater student participation in institutional governance and curricular affairs, 84.1%; (2) improved communications, 78.1%; (3) an improved educational opportunity for all students, 66.6%; (4) a more relevant and broader curriculum, 65.3%; (5) an adequate judiciary-due process system, 60.3%; and (6) an increase in responsible student behavior, 57.7%. Those anticipated outcomes receiving the lowest percentage of response were: (1) rule by a small but vocal minority, 12.2%; (2) black imposed segregation, 13.1%; (3) an institutional reaction resulting in increased conservatism on campus, 14.5%; (4) student involvement in hiring and firing of faculty, 19.1%; and (5) smaller classes and a more personal faculty-student relationship, 20.1%.

TABLE IX

Response to the Question, "As a consequence of past activities associated with student unrest on your campus, do you believe that there will be.....?"*

Possible Consequences	Overall		Students		Faculty		Administrators	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
a basic change in the structure and function of your institution	212	38.1	89	46.6	58	31.0	65	38.2
an improved educational opportunity for all students	379	68.1	136	71.2	121	64.7	122	71.8
a resolution of the causes of student unrest	219	39.4	79	41.4	77	41.2	63	37.1
greater student participation in institutional governance and curricular affairs	473	85.1	160	83.8	168	89.8	145	85.3
an adequate judiciary due process system	340	61.2	122	63.9	108	57.8	110	64.7
abolition of "in loco-parentis" for all students on your campus	218	39.2	66	34.6	79	42.2	73	42.9
increased flexibility in admission policies	214	38.5	88	46.1	76	40.6	50	29.4
smaller classes and more personal faculty-student relations	114	20.5	52	27.2	26	13.9	36	21.2
improved teaching performance	206	37.1	89	46.6	52	27.8	65	38.2
a more relevant and broader curriculum	366	65.8	136	71.2	117	52.6	113	56.5
less emphasis on grades	176	31.6	69	36.1	53	28.3	54	31.8
an increase in responsible student behavior	323	58.1	123	64.4	98	52.4	102	60.0
improved communications	437	78.6	155	81.2	153	81.8	129	75.9
student involvement in the hiring and firing of faculty	109	19.6	56	29.3	30	16.0	23	13.5
abolition of practices involving double jeopardy and double standards	173	31.1	73	39.2	47	25.1	53	31.2
a reaction by the public against your campus	185	33.3	69	36.1	59	31.6	57	33.5
an institutional reaction resulting in increased conservatism on your campus	109	19.7	40	20.9	36	19.3	33	19.4
distrust between students, faculty and administration	141	25.3	60	31.4	45	24.1	36	21.2
increased racial conflict	117	21.0	50	26.2	34	18.2	33	19.4
rule by small but vocal minority	71	12.7	34	17.8	14	7.5	23	13.5
black imposed segregation	75	13.5	32	16.8	17	4.8	26	15.3

*Not all respondents answered all questions, consequently, percentages often do not equal 100.

Conclusions.--Answers were sought to the questions raised in the introductory paragraphs of this report and generalizations drawn and presented in reference to the status, possible causes and expected future of student unrest.

Status.

1. Student unrest, as defined in this study, has manifested itself on the majority of the campuses of American colleges and universities during the past five years. However, only a small minority of the faculty and student body in higher education (less than 5%) have participated in activities associated with student unrest.

2. Communicating activities and those protest activities of a legal and generally accepted nature in a democratic society served as the means of expression for most of the student unrest. To a much lesser degree, unrest was expressed through extra legal non-violent and violent activities. The frequency of the activity decreased with the severity of the activity.

3. Seldom have the activities associated with unrest been ignored by the college administrators. The most prevalent form of action taken by the administrators who were confronted with student unrest was to engage in dialogue with the students. Relatively few resorted to the use of force. More than half of the respondents reported that the administrators granted the demands that the students had made.

4. On most campuses the problems and situations which led to student unrest no longer exist or have become less severe. But, for approximately one-fifth of the respondents the causative factors appeared to be unchanged or more severe than before on their campuses.

Possible Causes.

1. Although no single dominant cause of student unrest was observed, the area of communication, especially between students and administrators, was reported as a cause of student unrest more frequently than was any other area.

2. Factors associated with institutional governance and curriculum, especially the lack of opportunity for student participation in policy formation, appear to have contributed significantly to the unrest on campuses.

3. The factors that were personal in nature or associated with student life which seemed to be most closely related to causes of student unrest concerned the students' search for their role in society and their objection to the principle of "in loco-parentis."

4. Off-campus factors, including the media, organizations and individuals, do exert influence on students; however, no single agent appears to exert a significant influence on the student unrest movement.

Expectations.

1. Student unrest will continue to manifest itself on our college and university campuses. While it will persist at least into the near future, the unrest should occur on fewer campuses and involve a smaller number of students and faculty than in the past five years.

2. The amount and the scope of student demands will increase; however, they will be made in a more orderly manner and responded to by means that will result in less extreme activities than in the past.

3. There will be increased resistance to student unrest activities throughout the academic community.

4. As a consequence of student unrest activities of the past five years, there will be: (1) an increase in meaningful student participation in institutional governance and curricular affairs; (2) improved communications on campus; (3) a more relevant and broader curriculum and thereby improved educational opportunities for all students; (4) an adequate judiciary-due process system; and (5) more responsible student behavior.

In addition to the above generalizations, it was found that students, faculty and administrators differ in their perception of the status, cause and future of student unrest. The views of the faculty generally lie between those of the students and the administrators; thus, the greatest variations are between the students and administrators. These differences in perception will add to the difficulties involved in the communications between and among these three elements of the campus community.

Recommendations. Those recommendations which are made as a result of this study are surprising only in that they are so obvious and that they are made. They call for research and action which should have been taken on the campus long ago. The students, faculty and administrators should strive to:

1. Encourage further research into the area of student unrest. Investigations might take the form of traditional research as conducted in the behavioral sciences or perhaps follow an action research design cooperatively planned, designed and executed by members of the local academic community.

2. Facilitate a comprehensive self-evaluation at all levels of the institution and in terms of the relevance of its objectives, the effectiveness and efficiency of its operations and its impact on students and the larger community. While this should be a cooperative venture involving all sectors of the campus, it should be assisted by competent and objective off-campus evaluators. The implications of the results of the evaluation may form the basis for formulating appropriate changes which should then be implemented.

3. Provide an organization for decision-making that includes procedures which permit all who are to be directly effected by a decision to participate in its determination.

4. Establish and maintain open, honest and effective communication between and among all elements within the academic community.

References

Bayer, Alan E. and Astin, Alexander W., "Campus Disruptions During 1968-1969." Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, ACE Research Reports, Vol. 4, No. 3, August 1969, p. 46.

Cass, James, "Can the University Survive the Black Challenge?", Saturday Review, June 21, 1969, pp. 68-71+.

Sasajima, Masu, Davis, Junius A., and Peterson, Richard E., "Organized Student Protest and Institutional Climate." American Educational Research Journal, Vol. 5, No. 3, May 1968, pp. 291-304.